

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JOVAN WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 19-cv-1699-bhl

KRISTIN J. JENSEN, et al.,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Jovan Williams is representing himself in this 42 U.S.C. §1983 case. On November 30, 2021, the Court granted Defendants' motions for summary judgment and dismissed this case. Dkt. No. 127, 128. On December 6, 2021, Williams filed a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. Nos. 129.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), a party may move to alter or amend a judgment within 28 days of the entry of judgment. A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted only if a party can "clearly establish" either newly discovered evidence or a manifest error of law or fact warranting relief. *Harrington v. City of Chicago*, 433 F.3d 542, 546 (7th Cir. 2006) (citing *Romo v. Gulf Stream Coach, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 1119, 1122 n.3 (7th Cir. 2001), and *Bordelon v. Chicago Sch. Reform Bd. of Trs.*, 233 F.3d 524, 529 (7th Cir. 2000)). A "manifest error of law" "is not demonstrated by the disappointment of the losing party. It is the 'wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent.'" *Oto v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 224 F.2d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Sedrak v. Callahan*, 987 F. Supp. 1063, 1069 (N.D. Ill. 1997)).

Williams does not present any newly discovered evidence, nor does he assert that the Court made any error of law or fact. Williams simply demonstrates his disappointment with the Court's decision by rehashing the arguments he raised in response to the summary judgment motion and disagreeing with how the Court applied the law to the facts of his case. But a party's disagreement with the Court's analysis is not a sufficient basis for granting a Rule 59(e) motion. Accordingly, the Court will deny Williams' motion.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin on December 10, 2021.

s/ Brett H. Ludwig

BRETT H. LUDWIG

United States District Judge